

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**  
**ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

---

**DARYL J. ROGERS**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 05-0941**

**-vs-**

**JUDGE LITTLE**

**AVOYELLES CORRECTIONAL CENTER**

---

**JUDGMENT**

Before the court is the report and recommendation of the magistrate suggesting that the civil rights complaint filed by *pro se* Plaintiff, Daryl J. Rogers (“Rogers”), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii) for frivolity and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Rogers has timely filed an objection to the magistrate’s report.<sup>1</sup> After full record review, the court adopts the reasoning and conclusion of the magistrate. Rogers’s complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

Alexandria, Louisiana

9 September 2005



---

F. A. LITTLE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> This court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations by the magistrate. See United States v. Wilson, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2002); LR 74.1W(B) (2005). The district court is not, however, required to reiterate the findings and conclusions of the magistrate if found to be correct. See Warren v. Miles, 230 F.3d 688, 694-95 (5th Cir. 2000); Koetting v. Thompson, 995 F.2d 37, 40 (5th Cir. 1993).